

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/624,916	RUDOLPH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tim Heitbrink	1722	

All Participants:

(1) Tim Heitbrink.

(2) Klaus Bach.

Date of Interview: 15 March 2005

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. ~~The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.~~ *See above.*

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Bach agreed to the changes as set forth in the Examiner's Amendment. Such changes were made in order to have the specification agree with the drawings as well as putting the claim 1 in proper idiomatic English and to clearly set forth that the motor rotates the shaft. .